



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/655,598	09/05/2000	Paul Bobrowski	PB2	8119

545 7590 04/21/2003

HANDAL & MOROFSKY
80 WASHINGTON STREET
NORWALK, CT 06854

EXAMINER

PRATT, HELEN F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1761

15

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/655,598

Applicant(s)

BOBROWSKI ET AL.

Examiner

Helen F. Pratt

Art Unit

1761

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 March 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6-8 and 27-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6-8, 27-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

The finality of the last office action has been withdrawn.

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered. The listing on page 24 is also an improper incorporation by reference. The incorporation of essential material in the specification by reference to a foreign application or patent, or to a publication is improper. Applicant is required to amend the disclosure to include the material incorporated by reference. The amendment must be accompanied by an affidavit or declaration executed by the applicant, or a practitioner representing the applicant, stating that the amendatory material consists of the same material incorporated by reference in the referencing application. See *In re Hawkins*, 486 F.2d 569, 179 USPQ 157 (CCPA 1973); *In re Hawkins*, 486 F.2d 579, 179 USPQ 163 (CCPA 1973); and *In re Hawkins*, 486 F.2d 577, 179 USPQ 167 (CCPA 1973).

The information disclosure statement filed 9-5-00 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most

Art Unit: 1761

knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is not in the English language. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted state of the prior art.

The claims are rejected for the reasons of record cited in the last office action. Claims 9 and 10 further requires that particular amounts of maca a day. However, nothing new is seen in adding particular amounts of a known material, absent anything new or unobvious as in *In re Boesch*, cited in the last office action. Therefore, it would have been obvious to add particular amounts of maca to a food.

Nothing new is seen in the form of the food as in claim 11, which is within the skill of the ordinary worker to decide on as the composition of the food is the same. Therefore, it would have been obvious to make the food in a particular form and in particular amounts.

Claims 11-23 further require adding maca to various foods in particular amounts. However, absent any showing of anything unexpected or unobvious, nothing new is seen in using the maca plant as a food supplement or adding it to other foods. See *In*

Art Unit: 1761

re Levin as in the last office action. It is hard to understand how a plant that has been known and used for centuries is not used with other ingredients. However, no such references have been provided. Applicants admit as part of the prior art that the Maca tubers can be eaten fresh or dried. That they can be used with fruit juices, jams and puddings. (page 2, lines 16-25). Therefore, as jams and puddings normally have other ingredients in them, it is known to add Maca to other foods.

ARGUMENTS

Applicant's arguments filed 2-21-02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argue that maca powder is not liked by the western palate and must be mixed with other ingredients to make it palatable and that a food product must contain particular ingredients such as egg white so that the maca powder will not travel to the surface of the food product. However, the claims are not limited to such a recipe and are to adding maca in the dried form to make any and all shaped food products. In addition, no coaction of ingredients has been shown, that the addition of the maca powder makes for anything new and unobvious.

As to claim 2, Applicants argue that the prior art does not show maca in breads, cookies and pasta. Claim 2 is broadly to a cooked product. Certainly, puddings can be a shaped product as they take the form of their container.

Applicants argue as to claim 11 that adding maca to make a meal replacement bar or snack is not known. However, as in *In re Levin*, adding ingredients without a showing as to anything unobvious or unexpected does not make for a patentable product. Certainly, if the maca is used in Peru in various food products, it means that

Art Unit: 1761

this use is known, and as stated in the specification, it is known to use it in various food product.

As to the further broad uses of the maca powder in other foods, nothing new or unobvious has been shown in adding a know ages old food material to other foods, for its known inherent advantages.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Helen F. Pratt at telephone number 703-308-1978.

Hp 4-29-02

H. Pratt
HELEN PRATT
PRIMARY EXAMINER